



## REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE (RFA) FORM INTAKE INTERVIEW LOG

|  |  |                     |
|--|--|---------------------|
| <b>Date:</b> 5/19/2014   | <b>Interviewer:</b> Sue Guenter-Schlesinger, Laura Langley | <b>RFA #14 – 15</b> |
| <b>Person(s) Requesting Assistance:</b> [REDACTED]   |  |                     |
| <b>Contact Numbers (telephone, e-mail, etc.):</b>  |  |                     |
| <b>Status of Person(s) Interviewed (title, position, student status, etc.):</b> [REDACTED] |  |                     |
| <b>Requested Assistance Pertaining To (name, position, policy, project, etc.):</b>         |  |                     |
| <b>Concerns about</b> [REDACTED] <b>Search</b>   |  |                     |

To the best of your knowledge, please fill out the following:

Interviewee Status:    Male ☒ Female ☐    Administrator ☐    Faculty ☐    Staff ☒    Student ☐  
 Concern Regarding:    Male ☐ Female ☐    Administrator ☐    Faculty ☐    Staff ☐    Student ☐

**Category:** *(Please check at least one)*

- |  |  |   |                                     |  |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Color             | <input type="checkbox"/> Creed              | <input type="checkbox"/> Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Veteran Status      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marital Status                | <input type="checkbox"/> National Origin   | <input type="checkbox"/> Race               | <input type="checkbox"/> Religion   | <input type="checkbox"/> Retaliation         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sex/Gender                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Harassment | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment | <input type="checkbox"/> Genetic Information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gender Identity or Expression |  |   |                                     |  |

| Time Line        |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|
| Date             | Item                                      | Comments  |
| On or about 5/19 | [REDACTED] walked in and LKL met with him | [REDACTED] expressed concern that his friend with a disability was not considered for a finalist position; his friend did not note higher ed consultant experience b/c didn't seem like true higher ed experience. Looks like the finalists do not all meet the preferred qualifications and Chyerl had said that all the finalists meet the required and preferred qualifications. LKL will talk with Sue. |
| 5/23/14          | SGS t/c w Nancy                           | Nancy called regarding EO review of the Request to Interview she had sent for the [REDACTED] search. Sue wanted to make sure all candidates moving forward had higher ed experience. Nancy checked with Chyerl who confirmed that all candidates moving forward had higher ed experience and met the qualifications.  |
|                  | SGS t/c Chyerl                            | Based on the 5/9 conversation, Sue asked Chyerl to take another look at the pool and see if it made sense to bring more than 2 candidates to campus. There had been more finalists but a few withdrew from the search. Chyerl wants to interview the 2 finalists and if one of them does not work out, then she will look back at others in applicant pool.   |
| 6/2/14           | [REDACTED] emails Chyerl and copies SGS   | [REDACTED] is concerned that he does not see that the 2 finalists coming to campus meet all the preferred qualifications. [REDACTED] is seeking   |

|         |                                 |  |
|---------|---------------------------------|--|
|         |                                 | clarification. Chyerl writes back that it is not appropriate for her to provide detailed information because she is the search chair. Chyerl asks [REDACTED] to talk to EOO.   |
| 6/3/14  | SGS met with [REDACTED]         | Sue relayed her conversation with Chyerl and discussed EOO's role in reviewing search documentation. Not a discrimination matter. [REDACTED] asked EOO to review his concerns again.   |
| 6/6/14  | LE t/c to [REDACTED]            | LE calling on behalf of Sue. SGS reviewed concerns, no policy violation. We take his concerns seriously and will think about process improvements; however, no mandate that search committees bring in 3 candidates. SGS discussed again with Chyerl Wolfe-Lee and understood that at least 2 qualified candidates withdrew from consideration and that search committee would consider other alternates if the 2 candidates coming to campus did not result in an offer. [REDACTED] remained frustrated that the process could not be analyzed per transparent, measureable standards. [REDACTED] still concerned about "arbitrary nature of process. Wanted independent review of the process. Search committee has full discretion, how could you audit process?" [REDACTED] wanted 3-4 solid candidates in the finalist pool for comparison. |
| 6/17/14 | T/c from Chyerl to LE (SGS out) | CWL said that the President wanted to make an offer to [REDACTED] and was I okay with them going ahead? LE said needed to see the Request to Make Offer including completed dispositions. Chyerl said she would have to wait until Nancy returned from the doctor at 2 pm. Would LE be available to sign off then? LE said yes.  |
| 6/17/14 |                                 | LE reviewed Request to make offer and dispositions and signed off. LE called Chyerl to let her know she had signed off.  |
|         |                                 | [REDACTED] sent email and said he is very frustrated with search process but does not want his concerns raised to HR or leadership and will work with person hired.  |
|         |                                 | RFA closed   |